

**Worksheet**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

---

**Note:** This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this worksheet and the "Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet" located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

**AZ-040-2005-0002**

**A. BLM Office:** Field Office Safford **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** 06017  
**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Grazing Permit Renewal

**Location of Proposed Action:** Allotment Name Manila Wash 06017  
**Description of the Proposed Action:** Renewal of 10 Year Grazing Permit  
Renewal Period Ten Year 2004 to 2014  
Selective Management Category C

Permitted Use: aums 60  
Number- 5 Kind - Cattle  
Period of Use - 3/1 to 2/28 Active Use (AUMs) - 60

Other Terms and Conditions:

1. In order to improve livestock distribution on the public lands, all salt blocks and or mineral supplements will not be placed within a 1/4 mile of any riparian area, wet meadow, or watering facility unless stipulated through a written agreement or decision.
2. Failure to pay grazing bills within 15 days of the due date specified in the bill shall result in a late fee assessment of \$25.00 or 10 % of the grazing bill whichever is greater but not to exceed 250.00. Payment made later than 15 days after the due date, shall include the appropriate late fee assessment. Failure to make payment within 30 days may be a violation of 43 CFR Sec. (1) and shall result in action by the authorized officer under 43 CFR Secs. 4150.1 and 4160.1-2
- 3.If in connection with allotment operations under this authorization, any human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects or objects of cultural patrimony as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601; 104 Stat. 3048; 25 U.S.C. 3001) are discovered, the permittee/lessee shall stop operations in the immediate area of the discovery, protect the remains and objects, and immediately notify the Authorized Officer of the discovery. The permittee/lessee shall continue to protect the immediate area of the discovery until notified by the Authorized Officer that operations may resume.

**Applicant (if any):** Allen Bushman

**B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

LUP Name Phoenix District Resource Management Plan Date Approved 12/88  
LUP Amendment AZ State-wide S & G Amendment Date Approved 4/18/97  
Other document\*\* \_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved \_\_\_\_\_

\*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

\*\*List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Phoenix District Resource Management Plan (12/88) adopted the Eastern Arizona Grazing Environmental Impact Statement (9/86)

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

**C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

National Rangeland Reform FEIS - 1994  
Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS 9/86

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

Phoenix Grazing Biological Evaluation and Opinion 3/98 2-21-96-F-422  
Biological Evaluation and Opinion 2-21-88-F-167

**NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rationale: The Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS analyzed the continuation of grazing on these small custodial allotments that have a small amount of public land. The action is the same as that analysis.

---

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rationale: The Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS analyzed the proposed action, a no action, a reduced livestock grazing and a no grazing alternatives in the EIS.

**3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rationale: No new issues have been identified in the allotment short form evaluation. In addition the Safford Field Office has conducted upland health assessments, threatened and endangered species inventories for newly listed species, cultural clearances and documentation review for the allotment to check for any new issues that were not covered by the referenced NEPA documentation. There were no issues regarding nonnative invasive species and Environmental Justice.

**4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rationale: The methodologies used to complete the allotment evaluation and make a determination with regards to the AZ Standards for Rangeland Health are approved Bureau methods and covered in the EIS.

**5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rational: This allotment was listed in the EIS under the proposed action which would allow grazing to continue. Since nature of the action is unchanged, the direct and indirect impacts of grazing as those analyzed in the EIS remain unchanged.

**6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rational: The Safford Field Office completed the standards for rangeland health evaluation process for this allotment. Since the proposal is to renew the grazing permit, the cumulative impact analysis in the EIS would not change. The proposed action is within the range of reasonable, foreseeable developments that are discussed in the environmental consequences chapter in the EIS.

**7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, Rationale: The public was involved in the preparation of the Eastern Arizona Grazing EIS and the consultation coordination, and cooperation letters have been sent to agencies, organizations, tribes, and individuals advising them of the process and asking for information. Open houses have been held for permittees and the public, as well as involvement with the AZ Resource Advisory Council.

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Michelle Cox	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Tim Goodman	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Tom Schnell	Lead//Recreation/Wilderness Specialist	Recreation
Ted McRae	Natural Resource Specialist	Riparian
Del Molitor	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Dan McGrew	Archaeologist	Archaeology
Marlo Draper	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA

**F. Mitigation Measures:** List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

---

---

---

---

---

## **CONCLUSION**

☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

/s/ Tom Schnell

Signature of the Responsible Official

Tom Schnell – Acting Assistant Field Office Manager for Resource Use and Protection

02/16/2005

Date